

Dear Henry,

9/13.82

Your letter of the 10th presented me with a problem I resolved in favor of an immediate if hasty and unread response because you ask questions that can be basic to what you are into and will be doing. However, it is a doubly-bad time. I've been into affidavits taking a new tack and have not had a moment without them. Jim has agreed that I do a new assault on bad faith in the case for the field office records. I've done this, at book length, in the past 5-6 weeks in the King case. I believe it presents the only possibility of perhaps getting the courts to confront the deepest of subversion that comes from official lying to them, less politely perjury and its subornation, of which you've seen but a glimmer. If the courts accept perjury they become party to their loss of independence.

To now I've tried to avoid saying anything that might color your thinking. I've not tried to influence you and as long as you are, by your own lights, honest, it makes no difference to me what you think or will write. Perhaps this is the wrong way to put it. It does make a difference, but I guess I mean I recognize your right to think and say anything you believe, whether or not I do. Knowing you and I will not agree will not influence me, if that is the case. But you now get into what you may not regard as black-and-white but I do.

Basic in all of this, and I address it from memory and out of the sequences in your letter, is what are they hiding? It is a legitimate question to which there is some answer but far from complete. However, I think you have to begin with the understanding that the crime itself was never investigated. I can put this together for you with adequate documentation. Hoover is the best source, and I have it. Also, not long after the crime FBIHQ told the field offices there was no point in spending any time investigating it because it was solved. Both Dallas and New Orleans withheld this from me, perhaps because they filed it outside of where they should, but I picked it up in a Little Rock record. There are many other evidences of but these are explicit. (The same thing in the King investigation, which was only an elaborate fugitive case.)

How else can you account for the FBI's failure to do anything about the curbstone shot until forced to nine months too late? (Except in protecting Hoover's instant vision, of which he boasted?) Or failure to make any tests at all on the unfired round? Or not make significant ones on some specimens? Or refusal to get known crime-scene pictures? (On this remember in particular my Charles Bronson subject file.)

You mention having a researcher. I can't tell you how to use this time best, but I do think that if you could change your schedule and come here with the researcher and a tape recorder and ask me whatever you want and have the researcher make notes on what seems important to you, in the long run it may save you much time. The researcher can thereafter go over the files and make copies of whatever you want.

I suggest this also with regard to what theories of others you find attractive. You may, in the end, come to believe that you have wasted much time if you don't because some of the most attractive range from not probable to not possible.

Now, from the top.

I'll try to remember to ask Jim about the Kurtz annotations. I don't think it is necessary, tho. However, you'll have real trouble reading my writing, particularly when I am holding the book in one hand and writing with the other. I'd like to suggest something for your own thinking and understanding. I'm sure we both agree that there is nothing wrong with using the work of others - but much wrong in pretending that it is not their's but your own. Kurtz has virtually nothing of his own that is tenable and in virtually no case does he credit it. Rather does he castigate almost all the others. He likes Lane, so he alters the time of appearance of the original books to pretend he was first. Kurtz knows better and the books themselves are date

by their copyright notices. When they appear in the same year, they are dated in his own records by the reviews. And publisher's notices, which his own library provides. If you want to go farther on this, when you are here ask me about his citations, a dead giveaway. And some of his footnotes are entirely impossible. I mean, he is a crook, albeit an egomaniacal, self-righteous and self-important one.

HSCA's analysis of the NAA data. Totally flawed by the failure to authenticate the specimens Guinn tested and more so because he knew they did not match the original descriptions of them. Moreover, the tests were incomplete. no copper, for example, and Guinn himself made a study for Justice years ago on its superiority in such identification. (Study in the case record in my spectro/NAA case.)

The can get pretty byzantine. When I got to study 399, I saw immediately that the metal missing from the base (you are welcome to my pix) was cut out, but merely extruded in its career. But it was not accounted as missing in any Commission records, testimony or questioning. So I got Al Oser to question Frazier about it in the Shaw case and he readily admitted, as he did when we deposed him, that he had cut it out. But he did not weigh what he recovered (deposition), made no record of any kind about it, and it is a pretty fair sample, in size - much larger than was used in any testing. Where, then, is the remainder? What happened to it? When there is a test with the kinds of results Guinn reported, almost identical results, with any substance mixed as haphazardly as that core material, red flags ought go up right away.

On Kurtz's results; have your own check made. He lacks the most elemental understanding of those tests and his descriptions of it are not correct. I did not pay enough attention to his conclusions to recall them. But you can't accept anything he says without your own confirmation. He also lied about how they were disclosed, meaning the pre-Guinn records, and he does not even describe those records accurately.

I don't recall any other published analysis, except Guinn's own. He said he would do this and would send me a copy, but he sent me no copy. Even then, note the ~~same~~ flaws above.

Spectro case and Galt's flip-flops: Jim has finally charged him with perjury in the appeals brief, you may recall, if he sent it to you. The second one, fairly recent. He actually gave four different versions under oath. He finally produced the printouts on Q15, the windshield, along with all the others, about a year after directed to do so and then only the day we deposed him and then only when the deposition was almost ended. So there was no opportunity to question him about them.

Spectrographic test results: don't be afraid that any question is stupid. I finally got photographic copies of the plates still not withheld and originally lacking in proper identifications. I don't know that the identifications supplied later are full and correct. We had to compel that, even. No carbstone plate and no dependable accounting of it. All their explanations are impossible. They can't explain it and this may be one of the more comprehensible remaining questions for you. I'll not take time for this now. Perhaps you will know more later from the case records, which are fairly definitive and complete. And a little ~~more~~ unusual, even with a sample of a pulled bullet attached! There is no point in my having what I got reviewed by an expert now and I'd not try to use Guinn. Until I can have what I can regard as all, for my purposes but not necessarily those of others, I want everything because any such expense is major for me. In this connection, you may want to remember two things: that I have two sets of printouts, the FBI's now and the ERM's, and my layman's understanding of the nitrate test examination is that it addressed only the wrong thing and ignored fairly probative and necessary tests pertaining to whether or not Oswald had had a rifle to his face.

I know they did not give me all the notes because I found some hidden away in records I obtained in other litigation. They say the opposite of what "razier" led the WC to believe and they are his.

You may want to remember that one of the unusual things we are asking and on which the appeals court may rule - oral arguments the end of this month and I wish I could figure a way of getting there - is new and public testing of the curbstone, which I allege is patched, and of the shirt collar, to see if the slits coincide, which they do not and ~~cannot~~ cannot. Without doubt they were not caused by any projectile. Scalpels did it and the fastest way for you to find this id in Post Mortem, using the index on Dr. Charles Carrico. I've asked that if those tests are ordered, they be ordered with the press present.

I do not agree that 399 left fragments in Connally because from the condition of the outer surfaces alone it is impossible. Not even microscopic scratches on it.

Next you come to withheld info. There are specific illustrations, like what I'm after in 78-0322, the withheld transcript and teletyped summary of an Oswald/Mexico tape. The FBI has these. Can't be specific about CIA. Again, please consider what I assure you is true and FBI SOP in such cases, most of the records it provided have no pertinence to anything. Its usual answer to all problems is statistics and it phonies them all the time. So the page measure or percentages may have little meaning. I know this can be confusing and perhaps hard to believe, but all you need do is examine the records. They speak for themselves. And in the "ing case also.

I did not know that Marina had gotten the tax returns. She asked me to help her, I said I would, sent her the ~~necessary~~ necessary privacy waiver to sign, and she backed out. Thereafter, I sent her what I could that might help her if she made the effort on her own but I never heard a word. I think that Bud turned her off and she connected him with "ud hence I'm a stinker. She had usually gotten pretty bad advice, from the record. How do you know she got it? It may help us get it and then you can have it. If you have anything we can give the court, that can help.

Nosenko: I've gotten nothing new. But the biggest argument made by those questioning who say he was sent here to mislead and disinform over JFK is baseless because it did not exist. There never was any doubt about what the official investigations would conclude and it was leaked and published beginning 12/5/63. The leakers were Cartha DeLoach's henchmen, particularly Tom Bishop. A better question is why did anyone in an official position make that one up to undermine Nosenko's credibility?

Hosty: if you want, your researcher can review all that the FBI has disclosed because I have a set of duplicates in the subject file. No matter how little you say, you should be familiar with what it reflects about their internal investigation.

Jasty and Kostikov: is it really relevant? All the spookeries have such people in such post s as covers. Oswald in Moscow was seen and covered by Snyder, who was CIA. I don't think that has to mean anything, either. But if anyone wants to theorize along that line, can it be believe that he would have seen Oswald in a place everybody knew our spooks covered?

I know of nothing to indicate that Ruby and Shaw ever met each other. Garrison was a sewer into which all the nuts pissed and pissed. Ruby may well have been wired both ways. Really more. I can't disclose my source for any public use, but I've seen records reflecting that fact that he fondled immature girls in public and had the SBA up in arms about what he was doing to his favorite dog. If it is important to you, I can ask my source to let you have access. I was once to be permitted to make notes and copies, for which I then did not have time, and someone who was to have done it for me, probably someone you know, never got around to it.

may I tell you that ~~neckshot~~ above collar - only doctor who had a chance to see it, Carrico. Here

may I tell you that my texts for my thinking and in examination of official records are "The Purloined Letter" and "Through the Looking Glass" in "Alice in Wonderland?" (Without ever forgetting Orwell!) Carrico testified to it twice, as I quote and cite in Post Mortem, and went into it in more detail with me on interview. (See how this fits with the missing Cunningham examination of the slits in the collar? Or why Frazier asked for it? First rule id cover the FBI's ass. Second is cover my own ass.)

Torbett: my recollection is that it an irresponsible collection of all the nut theories. I think I have it but it is a total waste of time.

Second bullet hitting Connally: I don't know if I can find all the records now b cause I used them in litigation. The FBI Report, CD 2 1, says this. Facsimile in Whitewash. FBI and Secret Service report s also infacsimile in WW II and perhaps PM. I know I have a subnect file on this including Hoover's and Tom Kelley's snide cracks when the WC said otherwise. Also, an FBI report on its mockup, which even gives the point where the lino was./

The so-called mysterious deaths: Originally I was impressed by what Penn said about them, until I looked into them. None, in summary, had any reason to take any secret to the grave, few have any relevance at all, and most are ridiculous. Like how Whaley was offed: by an octogenarian kamikaze driving the wrong way on a divided highway. Can you believe it?

You refer to experts and I've cautioned you that you need a devil's advocate. You make a private criticism of Legend: Let me add one that pertains to expertise, so called. Epstein deliberately gave the wrong date for Oswald's departure from England because if he didn't his whole case fell apart. The reason is that it was impossible for him to have gotten to Helsinki by any known commercial carrier if he left the date he did leave. I have some CIA records on this and his passport is in the 26.

Too many have an ax to grind and could not care less about the stones they use.

On provocative questions, off the top of the head the entire case record in the spectro/NAA case, 75-226, may present the most provocative and easiest for the average reader to grasp. What I use of the executive sessions in WW IV and Post Mortem and Ford's corruption of the 1/27. On this the FBI withheld from me what it gave the Wx Post and Gardner told me about. Hoover annotated one of DeLoach's ~~xxxx~~ reports on Ford's finkery, "Toad!"

What is not one is what Kurtz pretty clearly cribbed from my first book and as usually with thieves, did it inaccurately: the dent in the rifle shell. Later, when I finally got my rifle back from Garrison and could try on the local police range, I was shown how it is possible to cause such a dent in actual firing. A local expert did it for me: excessive force in ejection.

I would be less than honest and helpful if I didn't raise with you the question of how far the RD will go in eviscerating its most helpful, longtime source, the FBI. Believe me, it has given the RD very much. I'm sure more than the records I have show.

Another is what I've called the Third Man, at least one other Oswald helper in his leafletting and picketing in N.O. The FBI has a print of one and doesn't disclose whose it is. I have many reports of others and more than enough in FBI records.

Another is the ~~xxxx~~ Bronson film, analysis of which may be out before you close.

If you want to use it in facsimile, I have Katzenbach's holograph, his advise to the White House: say from the fire that Oswald was alone and that the evidence would have convicted him. It makes sense of what followed. In the same memo, if I recall correctly, he recommended the Commission. Two days after the crime! I also have the typed copy. He's a sanctimonious, lying SOB!

Please excuse the haste and typos. Good luck!

If I were to break it down, off the top of the head again:

The corpus delicti evidence

The investigations

The non-investigations

What every publisher wants, the possibilities of conspiracies

Maybe the detective-story aspects of concerned citizens as sleuths (and in using the courts I'm trying to make the system work)

May some debunking of the craziest theories.

If you have any more long ones like this, could I respond with a tape recording?
Could you listen to it while you, lets say, drive?